

Chapter 1: Purpose of and Need for Action

1.1 Introduction

The project analyzed in this Environmental Assessment (EA) is located in Moab and unincorporated Grand County, Utah. The project covers improvements to a 3.7-mile portion of US-191 from 400 North in Moab to SR-279 (Potash Road) and includes the replacement of the US-191 Colorado River Bridge. The project study area is shown in **Figure 1-1**. (Figures are located at the end of each chapter.) Within the project limits, US-191 is typically two lanes and transitions from a rural road on the northern end of the project to a city street on the southern end of the project.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) scoping process for this project was initiated in 2004 as part of a Bridge Feasibility Study conducted for Project No. BRF-0191(23)128 (UDOT, 2004a). The Bridge Feasibility Study and scoping process helped identify the purpose and need for the project, logical termini, potential stakeholders, issues, concerns, and range of solutions. The NEPA scoping process is summarized in **Chapter 6**. The Bridge Feasibility Study and most other project-specific reports referenced in this EA can be accessed from the project website, <http://www.udot.utah.gov/coloradoriverbridge>.

The Bridge Feasibility Study evaluated traffic needs and the feasibility of alternatives that would correct the problems associated with the US-191 crossing of the Colorado River. The primary purpose of the Bridge Feasibility Study was to determine the feasibility of rehabilitating the existing bridge versus reconstructing or replacing the bridge. The recommendation of the Bridge Feasibility Study was to replace the existing bridge.

This EA has been prepared according to the provisions of NEPA and the corresponding regulations and guidelines of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the lead federal agency. This document also conforms to the requirements of the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT), the project sponsor and lead state agency.

1.2 Project Status

1.2.1 History

As early as 1809, fur traders were crossing this segment of the Colorado River. Grand County operated a ferry across the river from 1894 until the first Colorado

River Bridge was constructed in 1912. This original bridge was an impressive structure with three steel trusses spanning the river. In 1955, the original bridge was replaced by the current bridge structure to accommodate the increased need to move heavier equipment across the bridge.

1.2.2 System Linkage

As shown in **Figure 1-1**, US-191 is the primary entrance to Moab, Utah from both the north and the south. US-191 through Moab provides a critical link between Interstate 70 in Utah and Colorado and Interstate 40 in Arizona and New Mexico. US-191 also links Arches and Canyonlands National Parks, making Moab a popular tourist destination for both visitors to the parks and outdoor enthusiasts who enjoy the unique trails and sites in and around Moab. This tourist travel creates pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the vicinity of US-191 and across the Colorado River Bridge.

Without the US-191 crossing of the Colorado River, travelers between Moab and the recreational and scenic areas north of the Colorado River would have to detour 110 miles to cross the river (see **Figure 1-2** for a map of the nearest crossings of the Colorado River). SR-128 has load limit restrictions that further restrict its use as a detour. A detour would also cause substantial delays for emergency response vehicles.

1.2.3 Other Planning Studies and Projects

This US-191 Colorado River Bridge Project is one of several planning studies and projects that are on-going in the Moab area. Other relevant planning studies and projects are summarized as follows:

- **Moab to I-70 at Crescent Junction:** In 2005, UDOT completed the widening of seven miles of this project along US-191 (from SR-313 to SR-279) in Moab Canyon, immediately north of the project limits. The Moab to I-70 Project includes widening from two lanes to four lanes and a center median between SR-279 and Crescent Junction, as well as the construction of a bicycle path to SR-313 (UDOT, 2002).
- **Moab Main Street:** South of the US-191 Colorado River Bridge Project limits, reconstruction of Moab Main Street was completed in early 2007. The Moab Main Street Project reconstructs the existing roadway (four through lanes and a center two-way left-turn lane) from Overlook Road to 400 North in Moab (UDOT, 2004c).

- **Moab/Grand County North Corridor Gateway Plan:** The North Corridor Gateway Plan (Four Corners Planning, 2001) is being led by Grand County and the north corridor area applies to lands along US-191 within 500 feet of the highway, as well as parcels with highway frontage between the entrance to Arches National Park and the Moab city limits. The purpose of the North Corridor Gateway Plan is to ensure the north corridor area is welcoming and friendly to pedestrians, bicyclists, residents, and visitors by creating a positive first impression and providing economic opportunities. The North Corridor Gateway Plan includes sidewalk, park strips, and various aesthetic features that would mark the entrance (or gateway) to Moab. Land use development goals include encouraging hospitality accommodations and mixed-use tourism-oriented businesses.
- **Grand County Master Plan for Non-Motorized Trails:** Within the project corridor, the Trails Master Plan (Grand County Trail Mix Committee, 2005) identifies a system of interconnected existing and planned trails (see **Figure 1-3**) that would enhance bicycle and pedestrian connectivity and safety. These trails are described further in **Section 3.3.3**. The existing unimproved Courthouse Wash to Colorado River Bridge Trail that parallels the east side of US-191 north of the Colorado River Bridge is planned to be upgraded by UDOT as a transportation enhancement associated with this US-191 Colorado River Bridge Project. Other locally sponsored transportation enhancement projects are also underway, including the Colorado River Pedestrian Bridge (associated with the Highway 128 Bike Path) and the Highway 191 Bike Path. The upgraded Courthouse Wash to Colorado River Bridge Trail would connect the Colorado River Pedestrian Bridge to the existing paved Moab Canyon Bike Path that continues north from the Courthouse Wash kiosk.

1.3 Project Purpose

The purpose of the US-191 Colorado River Bridge Project is to:

- Provide a bridge that accommodates US-191 traffic over the Colorado River and also meets current structural design standards,
- Improve safety throughout the project corridor,
- Meet the existing and projected travel demand through the design year 2030 and provide continuity with the existing four-lane sections at either end of the project limits, and
- Facilitate the movement of bicycle and pedestrian traffic along US-191.

This project was initiated because the US-191 Colorado River Bridge does not meet current state and federal design standards. Although the bridge has served reliably over the past 50 years, the design codes and specifications used to design the bridge have been replaced or updated with newer codes. Current design guidelines use a larger design load and recognize issues such as fatigue, redundancy, and scour (as explained in **Section 1.4.1**). These issues were not fully understood when the bridge was initially designed.

Within the project limits, the bridge and roadway are typically two lanes. Additional capacity is needed on both the bridge and roadway to provide an acceptable level of service (LOS) for projected traffic demands (see **Section 1.4.2.2**) and to provide continuity between the four-lane sections of roadway on either end of the project limits. Safety should improve by following current roadway and geometric design standards.

As explained in **Section 1.2.3** and **Section 3.3.3**, the Trails Master Plan includes several projects relevant to the US-191 project corridor. Once complete, the trail system and other accommodations associated with this US-191 project (such as shoulder and/or sidewalk) would facilitate the safe movement of bicycle and pedestrian traffic along US-191.

1.4 Project Needs

Project needs were identified by comparing past, present, and future bridge and transportation data. Details about the project needs are provided in the following sections. In summary, the primary transportation needs for the US-191 Colorado River Bridge Project are a result of the following conditions:

- The US-191 Colorado River Bridge was built in 1955 and has a sufficiency rating of 47. A sufficiency rating of less than 50 indicates that the bridge is structurally deficient and/or functionally obsolete.
- The US-191 Colorado River Bridge is considered structurally deficient since it has been determined to be scour critical. A scour critical bridge has foundations that are unstable for the estimated design scour event.
- The US-191 Colorado River Bridge is functionally obsolete since it does not meet current design standards for shoulder widths and has nonstandard traffic railings.
- The roadway north and south of the project limits accommodates four lanes of traffic, while the bridge and roadway throughout the project corridor can only

accommodate two lanes of traffic. This constraint restricts traffic flow and does not provide adequate capacity for current and projected traffic demands.

- Pedestrian and bicycle facilities and accommodations are intermittent along US-191. Given that the area experiences over 1.6 million visitors per year (USDOJ, 2004), these types of facilities and accommodations are not only important to ensuring the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists but also to the economic well-being of Grand County.

1.4.1 Bridge Condition

1.4.1.1 Sufficiency Rating

The sufficiency rating is used by federal and state agencies to determine the relative sufficiency of the nation's bridges. A sufficiency rating indicates the structural and geometric adequacy of a bridge to remain in service. The rating is calculated using the formula defined by FHWA (2002). Eligibility for using federal Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program funds is also determined by the sufficiency rating criteria presented in **Table 1.4-1**. Since the US-191 Colorado River Bridge has a sufficiency rating of less than 50, the bridge is eligible for replacement funds.

Table 1.4-1 Bridge Sufficiency Rating Criteria for Federal Funding

Sufficiency Rating	Eligibility
≤ 80	Eligible for Rehabilitation Funds
< 50	Eligible for Replacement Funds
Source: FHWA, 2002.	

UDOT also uses the sufficiency rating as the basis for establishing priority for repairing or replacing bridges – the lower the rating, the higher the priority. The sufficiency rating formula is a method of evaluating the highway bridge data collected from bridge inspections by calculating separate factors to obtain a numeric value. The factors include items such as superstructure and substructure condition, structure geometrics, serviceability, average daily traffic, and detour length. The result of this method is a value where 100 represents an entirely sufficient bridge and zero represents an entirely insufficient or deficient bridge.

The primary factors causing the low sufficiency rating of 47 for the US-191 Colorado River Bridge are as follows:

- Deck geometry (FHWA Item 68) rates three out of 10 due to inadequate structure width,

- Bridge rail elements (FHWA Items 36A and 36D) rate zero, indicating that they do not meet current design standards, and
- Scour (FHWA Item 113) rates three out of 10, indicating that the structure is scour critical and is unstable under the design scour event.

These items correspond with FHWA's Guide for Structure Inventories and Appraisals (FHWA, 1995b).

1.4.1.2 Substructure Conditions

Bridge scour is a leading cause of bridge failure (FHWA, 2002) and occurs when streambed soils and sediments around bridge foundations such as piers and abutments are eroded by moving water. The underwater inspection (UDOT, 2003b) revealed that scour was taking place in the channel at the bridge foundations. In late 2003, UDOT placed scour mitigation and prevention measures (A-Jacks blocks) in the channel to help prevent additional scour. However, scour mitigation and prevention measures are not considered to be permanent solutions.

The underwater inspection also found that the bridge foundations had cracks, voids, areas of soft concrete, and some exposed steel reinforcement. The condition of the substructure below the mud line, including the condition and type of piling, could not be determined.

The visual inspection (UDOT, 2003c) indicated cracking, spalling, and other deterioration of the concrete piers. Piers that needed repairs were rehabilitated in late 2003 using fiber-reinforced polymer material and an epoxy ejection system. The purpose of these short-term repairs was to maintain the bridge so it could remain in service until future long-term bridge rehabilitation or replacement could occur.

1.4.1.3 Superstructure Conditions

The existing bridge uses a two-girder system. Since two-girder systems lack redundancy, both girders support the superstructure and must be intact to support the bridge. If either girder gets damaged or develops fatigue cracks, the bridge could collapse. The main girders of the bridge are considered "fracture critical." Fracture critical members (FCMs) are tension components whose failure is expected to result in failure of the bridge. When the bridge was designed, there was no distinction made between FCMs and redundant members. Current design practice avoids the use of FCMs. If FCMs are required, they are subject to more stringent design and fabrication requirements. The A7 steel used in the existing girders would not meet the current material requirements for an FCM.

Additionally, the existing bridge was designed for an H20 truck live load, which consists of two axle loads of 8,000 pounds and 32,000 pounds spaced at 14 feet. Since the size and frequency of highway loads have increased over the past 50 years, the H20 loading is no longer used for designing highway bridges. The current design live load specified by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and used by UDOT is an HL-93 truck combined with a uniform lane load. The HL-93 truck has three axle loads of 8,000 pounds, 32,000 pounds, and 32,000 pounds with variable spacing. The uniform lane load is 640 pounds per linear foot (PLF) per lane. The truck and lane load are applied concurrently and the truck axle spacing and location are adjusted to maximize structure demands.

1.4.1.4 *Shoulders and Traffic Railings*

The US-191 Colorado River Bridge has two 13-foot travel lanes and no shoulders. Since the current bridge has no shoulders, stopped or disabled vehicles block one or both lanes of traffic, causing safety concerns and potential problems for emergency vehicles. According to AASHTO (2001), a vehicle stopped on the shoulder should clear the edge of the traveled way by at least one foot and preferably two feet. The lack of shoulders also presents a potential problem for bicyclists and pedestrians, as discussed in **Section 1.4.4**.

On the outside of the bridge, the original steel traffic railings remain. This type of steel railing does not meet the National Cooperative Highway Research Program's (NCHRP) performance criteria for safety (NCHRP, 2003), and consequently UDOT no longer installs this type of railing on new bridges.

In addition to not meeting the NCHRP guidelines, the existing steel railing does not meet current AASHTO geometric and strength specifications. According to the UDOT Structures Division (Wheeler, February 1, 2006), the barrier on this structure should meet the TL-4 requirements of the Load and Resistance Factor Design (LRFD) Bridge Design Specifications (AASHTO, 2003). The existing rail does not meet the post setback and rail spacing requirements and does not meet the strength requirements for a TL-4 barrier (see Section A13.1 and A13.2, AASHTO, 2003).

The shoulder and rail deficiencies are safety issues. The TL-4 barrier post setback and rail spacing requirements assure a smooth barrier without catch points. Catch points can damage vehicles and may result in unintended redirection of the vehicle. The design strength requirements associated with the TL-4 barrier make it less likely that a car or truck would break through the barrier.

1.4.2 Continuity and Capacity

This section considers the need for cross-section continuity, as well as highlights the need for maintaining direct access to Moab. In addition, this section provides an overview of current and projected traffic conditions. These conditions are then compared to the available roadway capacity to determine the current and future LOS of the project corridor. Further detail regarding the traffic analysis can be found in the traffic report that is included as Appendix A of the Bridge Feasibility Study (UDOT, 2004e).

1.4.2.1 Continuity

The project corridor is a 3.7-mile portion of two-lane road between two sections of four-lane road. This remaining two-lane roadway cross-section at the bridge limits traffic flow. Vehicles approaching the bridge from either the north or south need to merge from four lanes down to two lanes.

The capacity of a rural two-lane road is less than half that of a rural four-lane road. Not only would the two-lane portion potentially exceed capacity (see **Section 1.4.2.2**), but vehicles traveling at the design speed in the four-lane section would approach slower-moving or stopped vehicles in the two-lane section. This sudden limitation in traffic flow, as well as traffic queuing across the bridge, presents several safety concerns including:

- The potential for high-speed rear-end collisions near the merge point is increased,
- The potential for sideswipe accidents as vehicles try to merge is increased, and
- The ability for emergency vehicles to access the river crossing is limited during periods of severe congestion.

Since the US-191 crossing of the Colorado River is the primary entrance to Moab from the north, many residents and visitors rely upon being able to cross the Colorado River at the current bridge location. South of the existing bridge, US-191 turns into Moab Main Street, the community's primary business district. According to a traffic survey conducted for the Bridge Feasibility Study (UDOT, 2004e), 73 percent of the traffic crossing the bridge had stopped or was planning to stop in Moab. This indicates that if an additional route were made available around Moab, the maximum reduction in traffic at the current crossing would be 27 percent. This reduction is not substantial enough to eliminate the need for increased capacity across the bridge (see **Section 1.4.2.2**).

1.4.2.2 Capacity

Level of Service Categories

Congestion occurs when the capacity of a roadway is exceeded. LOS is a method used to define congestion and the operating conditions on roadways. There are six LOS categories ranging from A to F, with LOS A representing the best operating conditions (free-flowing traffic) and LOS F the worst operating conditions (extremely congested, stop-and-go traffic). Vehicle speed and travel time represent operating conditions and determine the LOS. Under congested conditions, vehicle speeds are reduced and travel time is increased.

US-191 is categorized as a Class I two-lane highway. A Class I highway includes primary arterials connecting major traffic generators, daily commuter routes, and primary links to state or national highway networks (TRB, 2000). **Table 1.4-2** illustrates LOS criteria for a Class I two-lane highway, and **Table 1.4-3** shows the LOS ranges for unsignalized intersections.

Table 1.4-2 LOS Criteria for Class I Two-Lane Highways

LOS	LOS Definitions
A	Motorists can travel at their desired speed. No more than 35% of the time is spent following other vehicles.
B	Demand for passing is high. 50% of the time is spent following other vehicles.
C	Noticeable increase in following traffic with reduction in passing opportunities.
D	Unstable traffic flow. Passing demand is high but passing opportunities approach zero. Vehicle following length of five to 10 vehicles.
E	80% of the time is spent following other vehicles. Passing is virtually impossible.
Note: LOS F applies whenever the number of vehicles traveling on the highway exceeds the roadway capacity.	
Source: TRB, 2000.	

Table 1.4-3 LOS Ranges for Unsignalized Intersections

LOS	Average Delay (seconds)
A	0-10
B	>10-15
C	>15-25
D	>25-35
E	>35-50
F	>50
Source: TRB, 2000.	

Existing Level of Service

The UDOT minimum LOS in non-urban areas is LOS C, while AASHTO recommends that rural highways be designed to LOS B. As shown in **Table 1.4-4**, the existing two-lane roadway can only provide a LOS of C when traffic volumes are less than 690 vehicles per hour. According to the traffic analysis conducted for the Bridge Feasibility Study (UDOT, 2004e), the current demand is 804 vehicles per hour, which indicates that US-191 in this area is currently operating at LOS D. As such, existing traffic levels are causing inconvenience and delay for motorists due to inadequate capacity.

Table 1.4-4 Maximum Hourly Traffic Capacity by LOS

LOS A	LOS B	LOS C	LOS D	LOS E
NA	NA	< 690	691–1,282	> 1,282

NA = Not achievable for the given condition.
 Note: LOS F applies whenever the flow rate exceeds the segment capacity of 3,200 passenger cars per hour (two-way) or 1,700 passenger cars per hour (highest directional split). Values are based on a 45 mile per hour (mph) design speed.
 Source: UDOT, 2004e.

Future Level of Service

Highway Capacity Software (HCS) analysis was performed to calculate the maximum traffic volumes for the existing road and the related LOS. The analysis assumes that the bridge would remain a two-lane bridge with no pedestrian or bicycle facilities and no shoulders. **Table 1.4-4** shows the maximum traffic volumes for the existing road in order to maintain each LOS. The traffic analysis performed for the Bridge Feasibility Study (UDOT, 2004e) projected the future demand (design hourly volume) on the US-191 Colorado River Bridge in the year 2030 to be 1,454 vehicles per hour. Given this future demand, the existing road without capacity improvements would operate at LOS E (an unacceptable LOS). There are four main intersections on US-191 within the project corridor, including SR-279, SR-128, 500 West, and 400 North. SR-279 was recently improved with the Moab to I-70 Project. The remaining three intersections were analyzed using HCS to calculate the unsignalized intersection LOS, measured in seconds of delay experienced by drivers at the intersection (Michael Baker Jr., Inc., 2005). The analysis assumes that the future No Build condition is the same as the existing condition. **Table 1.4-5** shows the LOS, delay, and 95th percentile queue by movement for each intersection. The LOS is only reported for movements that must yield to other traffic.

Table 1.4-5 Year 2030 Intersection LOS

Intersection	Turning Movement	LOS	Delay (seconds)	95th Queue (vehicles)
US-191 and SR-128	US-191 Southbound Left	A	10	1
	SR-128 Westbound	E	42	6
	Left/Right Turn (shared)			
US-191 and 500 West	US-191 Northbound Left	B	11	1
	500 West Eastbound Left	C	18	1
	500 West Eastbound Right	C	18	1
US-191 and 400 North	US-191 Northbound Left	B	11	1
	400 North Eastbound Left	C	24	2
	400 North Eastbound Right	C	17	2

Note: The 95th Queue is the queue length that is not exceeded 95 percent of the time that traffic volumes are at or below the design hourly volume (DHV). The DHV is based on the 30th highest hourly volume for a one-year period. When the volume exceeds the DHV, the actual queue may exceed the reported 95th queue length.

Source: Michael Baker Jr., Inc., 2005.

1.4.3 Accident History and Deficiencies

Existing crash data obtained from UDOT show the accident rate and severity for this section of US-191 is currently lower than the expected rates for similar roadways in Utah (UDOT, 2004d). The predominant accident types were collisions with wild animals (57 percent) and vehicles that ran off the road (24 percent). With an increase in traffic, an increase in crashes would be expected as well. However, because there are many factors that affect safety, it is difficult to project future crash numbers.

Deficiencies associated with the US-191 Colorado River Bridge are identified in **Section 1.4.1**. Roadway and geometric deficiencies can also contribute to crashes. US-191 leading into Moab has several areas with inadequate shoulder widths and substandard clear-zone. The narrow shoulders require bicyclists and pedestrians to encroach into the travel lanes, causing safety issues for all road users. Like the shoulders on the structure, narrow shoulders on the road do not accommodate stopped vehicles. The substandard clear-zone increases the likelihood that a vehicle leaving the roadway would either hit an object or overturn. Most of the clear-zone hazards are steep slopes; however, utility poles and other fixed objects are near the roadway. In addition, there are areas where the roadway is nearly flat, limiting drainage and resulting in standing water that can cause drivers to hydroplane or lose control of their vehicle.

1.4.4 Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety and Linkage

Because of Moab's proximity to several popular recreation destinations, bicyclists and pedestrians use US-191 to access many of these destinations (see **Figure 1-3** for some of these destinations). Since the existing bridge does not have shoulders, pedestrians and bicyclists currently must share the travel lanes with motorized vehicles. This situation presents a substantial safety concern. To accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians on the shoulders, AASHTO guidance recommends a minimum usable shoulder width of four feet (AASHTO, 1999). AASHTO also advises that a minimum two-foot offset from the outer edge of the usable shoulder be provided from roadside barriers. Sidewalks are also recommended in developed urban areas and future sidewalks should be planned for non-developed urban areas.

Connecting existing bicycle paths also helps facilitate bicycle and pedestrian access (linkage) between destinations and enhances safety. **Figure 1-3** identifies portions of the Trails Master Plan within the project study area. This plan states,

...an integrated and environmentally sound network of trails and pathways for non-motorized use is vital to the future well being of Grand County and its communities. Pathways help to tie a community together in both a physical and a cultural sense while trails offer outdoor opportunities for residents and the many visitors upon which much of today's economy is based.

While many pedestrians and off-road cyclists would most likely use the planned separated trail system, it is unlikely that on-road cyclists would use these trails since they prefer the continuity and conditions offered by the roadway itself. Therefore, it is also important to incorporate the needs of on-road cyclists into the design of US-191 by including an adequate shoulder width in the roadway and bridge design.

Additionally, the US-191 Colorado River Bridge is important to trail connectivity and is an important safety benefit to trail users because it provides a grade-separated crossing of the trail system from US-191 (see Colorado River Bridge Underpass trail in **Figure 1-3**). The enhancement associated with the Courthouse Wash to Colorado River Bridge Trail would provide off-road cyclists trail connectivity to recreation points north of the Colorado River. Currently, cyclists are restricted from using this unimproved foot path.

1.5 Project Objectives

The project purpose and need has been developed using information gathered from both technical analysis and the public involvement process that is detailed in **Chapter 6**. To determine how well an alternative addresses the project purpose and

need, a set of project objectives and goals have been developed and are shown in **Table 1.5-1**. **Chapter 2** explains the alternative development process and conceptual alternatives considered, as well as the No Build Alternative and proposed Build Alternative. The proposed Build Alternative is the alternative that best addresses the objectives and goals outlined for this project.

Table 1.5-1 Project Objectives and Goals

Objectives	Goals
Provide a bridge that accommodates US-191 traffic over the Colorado River and also meets current structural design standards.	A bridge that meets current UDOT and AASHTO standards.
Improve safety throughout the project corridor.	A facility that meets current UDOT and AASHTO standards.
Meet the existing and projected travel demand through the design year 2030 and provide continuity between the four-lane sections on either end of the project limits.	<p>A facility that operates at a minimum LOS C through the design year (2030) during the peak hour.</p> <p>A facility that matches into the typical sections on either end of the project.</p>
Facilitate the movement of bicycle and pedestrian traffic along US-191.	<p>A facility that accommodates bicycles in the shoulder, both on the bridge and south of bridge (minimum shoulder width of four feet).</p> <p>A facility that provides sidewalks in developed urban areas and accommodates future sidewalks in undeveloped urban areas (south of the bridge), except where a separate path is provided.</p> <p>A facility that upgrades the existing unimproved Courthouse Wash to Colorado River Bridge Trail that parallels the east side of US-191 to provide a separated, paved path.</p> <p>A facility that continues to provide grade-separated trail access under the US-191 Colorado River Bridge (Colorado River Bridge Underpass).</p> <p>A facility that restores the use of other trails, if disturbed by the project.</p>
Note: Available funding and resulting impacts to the natural and built environment are also considered in the decision process.	

This page is intentionally blank.